

[Chomsky 1991 = Ch. 2; Chomsky 1993 = Ch. 3]

- (1) a. For Chomsky 1991, what, if anything, prevents overt raising of main verbs to Infl in English?  
b. For Chomsky 1991, what, if anything, prevents overt 're-raising' of main verbs to Infl in English?  
c. On the Chomsky 1991 and 1993 accounts, explain how overt raising of 'auxiliary' verbs is allowed.

((Look again at my HO "Verbal Morphology: Towards a Minimalist Account" for a refresher.))

[6 points]

- (2) Chomsky (1991, and especially 1993; see also Lasnik "Lectures on Minimalist Syntax" pp.26-29) argues that we should rethink the GB theory of Case in several ways, including the following:

a. The Case relation is a spec- $X^0$  relation rather than a government relation

b. Case is checked not assigned

Discuss conceptual and empirical motivations for these proposed revisions.

[4 points]

- (3) Consider the following contrast (of a sort first noted by Postal (1974):

a. ?John believed Bill very fervently to be innocent

b. \*John believed Bill very fervently was innocent

Discuss the contrast and its possible implications for the LGB and Chapter 3 approaches to Case. (Some of the phenomena discussed in Lasnik and Saito (1991) might be relevant.)

[4 points]

- (4) a. Chomsky (Ch.4) suggests that we consider LF movement as a species of feature movement (FF-movement) rather than phrasal movement. In particular, for economy reasons, at LF the only elements that move are formal feature bundles. Categories stay put. Suppose that this is correct, and assume that accusative Case in English is checked at LF. Describe how this will occur and specify what assumptions will be required to cover the binding data presented by Lasnik and Saito (1991).

b. FF-movement was also argued by Chomsky to mediate the agreement relation between an expletive and its 'associate' in existential constructions like (i), to avoid running into 'Davis's problem' about scope ('There aren't many students here' ≠ 'Many students aren't here').

i. There is a woman in the class

cf. There are women in the class

Assume that this is correct. What does your solution in (a) imply about the examples in (ii) and (iii)? Are these just as expected, or are there difficulties?

ii.a. \*There seems to himself<sub>1</sub> to be someone<sub>1</sub> eating a pizza

b. \*There seems to anyone to be no one eating a pizza

iii.a. Someone<sub>1</sub> seems to himself<sub>1</sub> to be eating a pizza

b. No one seems to anyone to be eating a pizza

c. Suppose we even eliminate feature movement and instead capture agreement by Agree. What are the consequences for the above phenomena?

[6 points]